Vol. X, No. 8 HUMAN EVENTS February 25, 1953

ATLANTIC DISUNION

By FREDA UTLEY

AMERICANS APPEAR to cling to their illusions more persistently than any other people. For years they pinned their hopes on "One World", with the Communist lions and democratic lambs bedded down together in the United Nations, and only our former enemies left out in the cold. When it became impossible any longer to believe that the Soviet Union is either "peace-loving" or "democratic", we established a more exclusive club called NATO. When it was no longer possible to pretend that Europe could be defended without the Germans, who are excluded from both clubs, we still refused to face up to the realities of the situation. Instead, we endeavored to bring the Germans in by the back door, as second class or associate members, without voting rights or the use of the club's facilities, but required to pay the same dues as regular members. This was to be done by the formation of "European Defense Community" (EDC) — an army composed of French, Belgian, Dutch, Italian, Luxembourg and German contingents.

Thus, it was thought, we should be able to utilize the courage and military genius of the Germans without reviving German "militarism". The new German army was to have no German General Staff, and was to be so tightly controlled by EDC and NATO that it could never be utilized for such "nationalistic" aims as the reunification of Germany, or for the recovery of the German territories we handed over to Russia and Poland at Yalta. In a word, the Germans were to be rearmed for the defense of Europe but were themselves to abjure the most legitimate national aspirations. The stallion was to be castrated but was expected to defend the herd of European mares.

Even the State Department understood that the Germans could not be expected to like the dangerous and unrewarding role assigned to them. But it was believed that their consent to it could be had by making an end to the Western Occupation of their country, contingent on their contribution of twelve divisions to a European Army. As one German paper expressed it, we offered "to loosen the chains of the prisoner on condition that he bear arms for his master".

Copyright 1953 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IN THE "PEACE CONTRACT" signed in Bonn last May, a couple of days before the EDC Treaty was signed in Paris, we promised to curtail the exercise of the "Conqueror's Rights" we have claimed ever since Germany's unconditional surrender. The Federal Republic was not to acquire either sovereignty or freedom from interference in its internal affairs, but it was to obtain the status of at least a semi-colonial country.

It was an ingenious idea. Nevertheless, Dr. Adenauer and his government were prepared to sign it, and to do anything required of them by America, which alone among the Occupying Powers has helped Germany recover from the devastation of the war, and which had forced the British and French to stop the dismantling of German industry. Dr. Adenauer is convinced that Germany's (and Europe's) only hope of survival depends on Franco-German collaboration, and a united Europe backed by America. And the great majority of the German people, realizing full well what Communist conquest would mean, are prepared to forget their resentment at the injuries and insults heaped upon them by the Western powers. They are for the most part ready to make sacrifices in order to establish a viable European Defense Community.

France, however, was not satisfied. Unable and unwilling to defend Europe herself, she insists that no one else shall be permitted to do so. Like an aging and passé prima donna she insists on playing the leading role in the opera. So there is no performance. As Bertrand de Jouvenel said to me in Paris: "France wants a German army stronger than Russia's and weaker than her own." Since this is impossible, France continues to fight to the last gasp of the last deputy to prevent Germany from defending what is left of European civilization.

All this is not to say that there is no hope of Franco-German reconciliation and collaboration. Both German and French military men tell you that if it were up to them there would already be a real EDC. And the Frenchman in the street seems to harbor few if any strong anti-German feelings. But the politicians who rule France, or fail to rule her, cloak their venality and incompetence with appeals to fear and hatred.

IT WOULD SEEM THAT the British are also doing their best to destroy any hope of European unity. Fearful of German industrial competition, and jealous of America, Britain is busy fanning the flames of Atlantic Disunion. Not only are the English up in arms against American proposals to win the war in Korea by a blockade of Communist China and the unleashing of Chiang Kai-shek's forces; not only does England insist that her Hong Kong trade with the enemy, and that of Malaya and Ceylon, have priority over the lives of her own soldiers as well as ours in Korea; not only is British trade with Soviet Rus-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sia and its satellites via Hamburg and Kiel a scandal in Germany — the British also appear to be doing their utmost to undermine America's European policy.

The British arrest in January of Dr. Werner Naumann, and six other former Nazis, showed which way the wind is blowing. The British High Commissioner himself admitted that he had no evidence that these men, still held in prison without trial, were plotting to seize power by force, or that they constituted any danger to "the security of Allied forces". They are simply accused of having tried to acquire influence over the Free Democratic Party. If the consequences were not so serious it would be a joke. For the British, who accuse us of "witch-hunting" when we imprison our Alger Hisses and indict our Owen Lattimores, consider themselves justified in imprisoning Germans (and denying them access to their lawyers) on the charge that they were endeavoring to influence, by the use of democratic processes, a legitimately established political party.

By this highhanded action the British achieved a variety of interconnected objectives. In the first place they served notice on the Germans that the "reserved rights" of the Western Powers, under both the Occupation Statute and the "Contractual Agreement", mean that the population of the Federal Republic has no guarantee of civil liberty or other basic democratic rights. The Social Democrats, and others who oppose ratification of the Treaties, have all along objected to the clause which permits us to suspend the German Constitution whenever, in our opinion, there is "a threat to the basic democratic order", and the British action serves to strengthen this opposition. The arrest also helped the French opposition. Thus, with extraordinary skill the British have managed to increase the obstacles to the consummation of America's European policy.

I ARRIVED IN PARIS a few days after the British arrest of the "Naumann circle". There I heard from an especially well-informed source a story which highlights Britain's action in Germany. Churchill, I was told, had asked Eisenhower to abandon the whole idea of EDC and revert to a straight Anglo-American alliance. Eisenhower not only rejected the idea but also reminded Churchill that he used to talk a lot about European unity before he again became Prime Minister. Thereupon Churchill went off to Jamaica in a huff and sent a telegram to Eden instructing him to let the British High Commissioner Ivone Kirkpatrick go ahead with his long cherished plan to arrest Naumann and his friends.

A week later, in London, I heard reports which substantiated this explanation of the arrests. Churchill, it was said, had tried to persuade Eisenhower "to shift the emphasis from Europe to the British Commonwealth", and had also strongly opposed the adoption of a more vigorous anti-Communist policy by the United States both in Europe and the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Far East. A Conservative M.P., who knows Churchill well, told me that the Prime Minister wanted at all costs to maintain his wartime ties with the Labor Party. Since even the Right wing of the Labor Party is now appeasement-minded, this means that Britain as a whole is opposed to the rearmament of Germany, and is for a soft policy toward the Chinese Communists. And it was a Labor M.P. who told me that Eden is a "woolly liberal" far less determined to stand up against Stalin than was the late Ernest Bevin.

All these explanations for Britain's curious, and seemingly anti-American, policies and sentiments may be farfetched. Perhaps the true explanation is far simpler. Despite the proposed "trade not aid" policy, England expects that we shall do our duty by her with respect to aid, even while she goes after more trade. She fears German competition most and would have even more reason to fear that of a united Europe in which Germany would, inevitably, become the industrial leader. Not only are the Germans more energetic and resourceful than the British today; they also enjoy the advantage of a free competitive economy; and the little American aid they have received, in comparison with that obtained by France and England, forced them to become self-supporting to a far greater degree.

In arresting the "Naumann circle" were the British afraid of the circle's Nazi inclinations *or* of their business activities in the Middle East? According to a report in the popular German weekly *Der Spiegel,* one of the "culprits", Zimmerman, was in Egypt last May as a representative of German iron and steel interests, invited to conclude a deal for the supply of agricultural machinery. Two of the other men arrested, Dr. Scheel and Herr Kaufmann, are said to be friends of the Grand Mufti and also had connections with Iran. And Naumann himself is the legal adviser of a German-Belgian export firm called Lucht and Company, which, at the time of his arrest, was negotiating a contract for the construction of a monorail railroad in the Congo, the plans for which were seized by the British. All in all, it is not fanciful to suggest that German trade relations with the Arab countries and Africa concern the British more than the ideology of the "Naumann circle".

Europe, from across the Atlantic Ocean, may look like an entity. In fact it is composed of elements so diverse and mutually opposed as to render abortive all plans based on the conception that it is, or can be induced to become, a unit, without our exertion of pressure upon the nations intent on fostering Atlantic Disunion.

Freda Utley, author of *The China Story,* has just returned from Europe and is engaged in writing a new book on Germany.

ADDITIONAL COPIES: One—$.20; six—1.00; ten—1.50; fifty—5.50; one hundred—10.00. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Volume X, No. 8 Wednesday, February 25, 1953 Washington, D. C.

LIBRARY MAR 10 '53

Yalta: Not since the Conant appointment has Capitol Hill undergone such a wave of protest as has occurred in the past week over the Eisenhower message on "repudiation of Yalta". And the reason for the uproar is that the "repudiation" of the vicious agreement which sold out Poland and the peoples of Eastern Europe is — as recommended to Congress — no repudiation at all. Hence, the revolt among the Senators.

The Polish groups are up in arms and one of their leaders described the President's proposal as "catastrophic", so far as Polish-Americans are concerned. The politicos know what this could mean in terms of votes, in 1954 and 1956.

The Poles and others recall the pledge in the Republican platform to repudiate Yalta. General Eisenhower reiterated this pledge on Pulaski Day, October 11, at Denver, when he received Polish-American leaders. According to the *New York Times* account, October 12, Eisenhower told his visitors that "the platform of the Republican Party pledged repudiation of the Yalta Agreement which through the violation of the principles of the Atlantic Charter and through its unilateral violation by the Soviet Government has resulted in the enslavement of Poland". This was clearly a formal promise of repudiation.

Instead, the President sent to Congress a request that the legislative body pass a resolution rejecting any Russian interpretations of wartime agreements that "have been perverted to bring about the subjugation of free peoples". The President's demand did not specify the agreements by name. In short, Eisenhower does not reject the Yalta agreement *per se*. His proposal to Congress is scant nourishment for the minorities involved and it loses impact on the peoples behind the Iron Curtain. As a move in psychological warfare, it is a dud, according to experts in this field of activity. And political leaders of these American minorities say that Ike has reneged on his campaign pledge.

The Eisenhower request to Congress — observers note — is also essentially a Democratic Party line of action. For some years, the "line" of the Democratic Administration has been that the Yalta Agreement itself was good, but that it failed because Soviet Russia did not live up to its pledges of free elections, free press, etc., in the Iron Curtain countries. This apologia, of course, was designed to whitewash the errors of Roosevelt and the State Department advisers who helped frame the Yalta Agreement. At the time, few informed people outside the State Department placed such faith in Soviet promises: it was another case of "think no evil of Moscow" — which was the guiding principle of the State Department bureaucracy, including one important and historic figure, Alger Hiss. Hence, what disturbs Senators as much as the failure to honor the campaign pledge to Polish-Americans is the Eisenhower Administration's apparent adherence to the discredited line of the Democratic Administration, repudiated by the electorate last November. This — if that adherence continues — may prove a rather serious matter.

Ike and the Press: The first Eisenhower press conference went off well, in the opinion of most press observers. Not unnaturally, it drew some caustic comments from hardened Democrats among the newspapermen, and among so-called Republican scribes (who had privately wanted Stevenson to win). But,

Copyright 1953 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

allowing for Ike's admitted inexperience, it deserved the description of "good". One refreshing action by Ike was well received by some. When the President wished to bring the conference to a close, he bluntly but politely declared it ended. Under Roosevelt and Truman, stooges of the Administration would often terminate the conference by piping up, "Thank you, Mr. President" — sometimes just as a colleague asked a question embarrassing to the President. Ike's forthrightness deserves praise.

Res Militaris: The appointment of General Sokolovsky as the new Soviet commander is considered an omen of a more belligerent attitude by the Soviet Union. It is recalled that Sokolovsky was the commander in Berlin when the Reds sought to strangle that city economically and when the Western powers staged the phenomenal airlift. This Russian general is classified, by American military men, as "anti-American" and an exponent of the "treat 'em tough" school. Advices from Western Europe suggest that perhaps another attempt to garrot the beleagured German metropolis is already commencing.

● Capitol Hill is looking forward eagerly to the appearance of General Van Fleet before its committees early in March. The retiring commander in Korea, it is anticipated, will give an important exposé of that difficult problem. One member of Congress put it: "For the first time since General MacArthur was dismissed and told his story on the Hill in 1951, Congress should receive a non-political explanation from a military man on the whole Korean situation." Van Fleet, it is reported, will have a full-dress "show": he will appear before a joint meeting of the military committees of both Houses and also before a joint meeting of the two congressional committees concerned with foreign policy. Members of these groups are already preparing sharp questions and there is much discussion as to how much Van Fleet will venture to reveal. It is remarked that he is retired and therefore presumably free to talk.

● A new round in the inter-service row between the Navy and the Air Force. For some time, Arthur Godfrey, well-known broadcaster, had been a great favorite with the Navy and he in turn seemed very hospitable to the Navy's point of view. Recently, however, the Air Force stole a march on the Navy: Air Force General LeMay took Godfrey on a tour of the Air Force foreign bases (so criticized by friends of the Navy). Suddenly, friends of the Navy became critical of Godfrey and began writing letters to Congress asking who paid for this. The Air Force answered, "Godfrey".

Byrd and Taft: Although the orators did not refer once to "realignment", that developing political idea pervaded a banquet in the Capital on February 23, held to honor the memory of George Washington and to make awards to Senators Byrd and Taft.

The two Senators paid tribute to each other in short speeches. Political observers noted that Taft in his remarks made a distinction between Southern Democrats and New Deal Democrats. As for Byrd, he emphatically spelled out his distinction in these words: "When I speak of Democrats, I mean Jeffersonian Democrats and when I speak of Republicans, I mean Taft Republicans." And the Virginia Senator proudly reminded his audience of his visit to Ohio in 1950 to speak for the re-election of Taft. The toastmaster of the evening, former Senator Burke of Nebraska, underlined the similarity of political faith of the two Senators. Burke, it was recalled by many present, served as a moving spirit of the Committee to Explore Political Realignment, which was active in the winter of 1951-52. Senator Mundt and former Senator Brewster, both outspoken advocates of realignment, were also present.

Another note was struck, although press reports on the meeting failed to mention it. The Good Government Society (sponsor of the gathering) awarded scrolls to both Senators, for their many "contributions to good government". The Taft scroll included tribute to the Ohioan's stand on two issues: his opposition to the *ex post facto* character of the Nuremberg trials and to President Truman's proposal (in 1946) to break the railway strike of that year by drafting the strikers.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tax Rebels: "Your mention of social security rebels is partial to the ladies", writes the latest insurgent in this war against taxes, Thomas Gaskins of Palmdale, Florida. (We had previously reported other examples, including Vivien Kellems and the housewives of Marshall, Texas.) Gaskins tells us that since the third quarter of 1951 he has refused to pay social security taxes for his help and that the Internal Revenue agents have seized his bank funds twice. "I have also refused to pay on myself", he remarks, "and strange to say they haven't bothered me about my personal social security tax."

Mr. Gaskins seems to be an individualist. He styles himself the "originator of the cypress knee industry"; cypress knees are odd growths, often quite decorative, from the roots of the trees found in Florida swamps. In addition to his mail order business, he maintains the Cypress Knee Museum. He reports that he will not expand business because additional help would mean "another tax regulation and more red tape".

The accumulation of incidents such as these goes far to explain why the House of Representatives, which holds the constitutional power to levy taxes, insists on making an unqualified tax cut this year, despite contrary advice from the Executive branch.

Truman as Author: Ex-President Truman has just announced that he has sold the publication rights of his memoirs to Life Magazine. Less than a year ago, Mr. Truman was launched on the literary seas with *Mr. President*, a volume of edited personal diaries, letters and notes, which was offered to the public at the price of $5.00. Today, drugstores in Washington have placed large numbers of copies on their remainder stands at the price of $1.19.

This is not merely a sardonic note on Mr. Truman as an author. It also suggests that there's always another "sucker" publisher coming along. Indeed, the example of last year's presidential literary effort is — or ought to be — instructive.

The *Reader's Digest* purchased book rights on the Truman book last year and seemed mighty proud of getting the business, judging by some publicity to the effect that the *Digest* had paid its highest price for the product. Yet, when the book appeared in the bookstores it was a literal "dud". Not long after publication, the trade had reports that some 70,000 copies had backed up in the bookstores — the merchants couldn't turn them over. It was a stupid book by a stupid man, and the public, it is reasonable to believe, already knew the second fact and assumed the other.

Quite obviously, the publishers — book and magazine — badly misjudged the attitude of John Q. Public. The election results of last November demonstrated — most political observers agree — that the public mandate was one against Truman and Trumanism. The public, which was (to put it mildly) suspicious of the President and his regime, apparently wanted an exposé of that regime and its chief — not a favorable self-portrait.

What the public seemed to want was illustrated by a piece which had appeared a few months previously in the *American Mercury*. It was a well-documented picture of Mr. Truman's personal financial record of the past. It hardly reflected favorably on the Truman character. The *Mercury*, with scant finances for promotion, nevertheless "went to town" on this piece and the article had a wide distribution.

All this took place at a time when magazines were engaged (they still are) in a terrific circulation war. Perhaps some of these mass magazines will tumble to the answer of their circulation troubles. They can look back to the success of a publisher of another era — one S. S. McClure, the great man of his trade in the period 1900-17. McClure scented the rising popular feeling against business monopolies ("the trusts") and against municipal corruption; and he set Ida Tarbell and Lincoln Steffens to work with their pens. McClure made history because he had a sense that history was in the making.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Forces Affecting American Education: 1953 Yearbook, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (a department of the National Education Association, Washington, D.C.). Reviewed by Burton Rascoe.

The Politburo of the National Education Association has laid down its latest smoke screen of propaganda in defense of NEA-sponsored textbooks. Many of these textbooks derogate every accomplishment under the capitalist system and under the American Constitution; they whitewash the slave-labor camps and every brutally tyrannical aspect of the Stalinist dictatorship; they preach the virtues of the collectivist welfare state; and they indoctrinate school children with false claims for UN and UNESCO and with delusions about internationalism and world government.

The barrage consists of a 208-page, two-year report compiled by "fourteen leading educators", on the "Forces Affecting American Education". It comes from the Washington Headquarters of the NEA's registered lobby, which boasts eleven salaried pressure men. The salaried lobbyists of the NEA and its affiliates number six more than the lobbyists listed by the CIO and five more than the lobbyists listed by the National Association of Manufacturers.

Platform spokesmen of the NEA's Politburo are opposed to the Feinberg law, the McCarran Act, loyalty oaths and State legislation barring the use of textbooks deemed "subversive" in the public schools. They combat the efforts of the Sons of the American Revolution, the American Legion and other patriotic organizations and individuals to rid the public schools of teachers and teachings, and they defend the "progressive" teachers neglect of instruction in reading, writing, arithmetic, geography and history.

The report is not the work of "leading educators" but of wheelhorses and functionaries of so-called "progressive" education, welfare statism and one-worldism. Nine of the 14 are not of sufficient distinction to have been tapped by *Who's Who*, which is notoriously partial to "educators".

The NEA's "report" seeks to discredit John T. Flynn and his book *The Road Ahead*, by quoting the Buchanan (House) Committee's majority report that the Committee on Constitutional Government has "recently distributed thousands upon thousands of John T. Flynn's *The Road Ahead*", and that Dr. E. A. Rumley had been convicted of contempt of the congressional committee for refusing to disclose the names of persons who had purchased copies of the Flynn book through the Committee for Constitutional Government.

The NEA's report neglected to state what is wrong, morally, legally or ethically about purchasing and reading a copy of *The Road Ahead*. The NEA report also neglected to say that the contempt action was set aside by a Federal Court of Appeals, which stated that the Buchanan Committee had exceeded its proper authority in seeking the names of purchasers of copies of Flynn's work and that this was a brazen attempt to infringe upon the Constitutional guarantees of a free press and free speech.

The political objectives of the Politburo of the NEA are stated plainly enough, if a little less blatantly than usual, on pages 27-28 of this NEA "report":

"The individualistic social theory of the founding fathers is being supplemented by new forms of social organization and social control. Our free enterprise system, which is still the determinant of our economy and not infrequently of our national and international policy, is nevertheless being modified by our social-welfare concept."

Also:

"Over the years there has been a gradual modification of the principle of property rights and of public welfare. In eighteenth century theory, property was as sacred as life and liberty. . . . The rationale has been *liberty* rather than either *equality* or *fraternity*. . . . This trend toward a balance between the welfare of the individual and the welfare of society is in conflict with earlier assumptions. It is a trend which we cannot ignore."

It may be a trend we can not ignore. But we can fight it tooth and nail.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.00; six months, $6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED